UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

ALAN BRAHAMSHA, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

STARBUCKS CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. C16-1667RSM

ORDER DENYING STIPULATION TO EXTEND BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND RENOTING MOTION

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' purported Stipulation and Proposed Order to Extend Briefing Schedule on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, Dkt. #20, filed by Defendant Starbucks Corporation. The Court has reviewed this stipulation and finds that it is signed by counsel for Plaintiff who have not made an appearance in this matter nor obtained *pro hac vice* status. Dkt. #20 at 2. Accordingly, the Court finds the Stipulation invalid.

Plaintiff states (through Defendant's filing) that he is in the process of obtaining local counsel and expects that an appearance will be filed within a week. Given the pending deadline at issue and Defendant's clear willingness to renote its own pending Motion to Dismiss, the Court will *sua sponte* renote the Motion for consideration on December 23, 2016, pursuant to

Local Rule 7(1). Plaintiff's deadline to file his opposition will be December 12, 2016, and Defendant's deadline to file its reply will be December 23, 2016.

Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS:

- The Stipulation and Proposed Order to Extend Briefing Schedule on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. #20) is DENIED.
- 2) The Court *sua sponte* re-notes Defendant Starbucks' Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. #19) for consideration on December 23, 2016. Plaintiff's deadline to file an opposition will be December 12, 2016, and Defendant's deadline to file a reply will be December 23, 2016.
- 3) The Court directs Defendant to send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff via counsel.

 DATED this 2nd day of December, 2016.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE